

**Salton Sea Air Quality Technical Working Group (SSAQTWG) Meeting
May 15, 2008**

Name	Affiliation	Email/phone
Pamela Vanderbilt	CH2M HILL	pvanderb@ch2m.com 916-286-0292
Debbie Soukup	UNLV	gsoukup@bak.rr.com 702-469-8669
Jodi Lee	CH2M HILL	josephine.lee@ch2m.com 801-560-1889
James King	DRI	james.king@dri.edu 702-862-5315
Mike Walker	Bureau of Reclamation	mwalker@lc.usbr.gov
Frank Stradling	Agrarian Research	Frank_Stradling@yahoo.com
Earl Withycombe	ARB	ewithycombe@arb.ca.gov 916-322-8487
Brad Poiriez	ICAPCD	bradpoiriez@imperialcounty.net 760-482-4606
Phil Fine	SCAQMD	pfine@aqmd.gov 909-396-2239
John L. Scott	MWD	jscott@mwdh2o.com 213-217-7823
Bruce Wilcox	IID	bwilcox@iid.com 760-339-0735
Jonathan Chapman	Torres Martinez	jchapman@torresmartinez.org 760-397-0300 ext 1224
Jerry Boles	DWR	bolesj@water.ca.gov 916-654-7128
Jesus Ramirez	ICAPCD	jesusramirez@imperialcounty.net 760-482-4606
Adolfo Garcia	ARB	agarcia@arb.ca.gov 626-575-6701
Sylvia Oey	ARB	soey@arb.ca.gov 916-322-8279
Kent Norville	Air Sciences	knorville@airsci.com 503-525-9394 x112
Brian Schmid	New Fields	bschmid@newfields.com 916-517-2480
John Carter	IID	j.carter@hkcf-law.com 760-352-2821
Thang (Vic) Nguyen	DWR	tnguyen@water.ca.gov 916-653-2986
Pat Cooper	Senator Ducheny	pat.cooper@sen.ca.gov 760-398-6442
Arturo Delgado	DFG	adelgado@dfg.ca.gov 760-200-9186
Carla Scheidlinger	AMEC	carla.scheidlinger@amec.com 858-300-4311
Don Caniparoli	CH2M HILL	don.caniparoli@ch2m.com

		503-736-4320
Al Kalin	Imperial County Farm Bureau	akalin@hughes.net 760-455-1399
Charles Keene	DWR	chuckk@water.ca.gov 818-500-1645 x235
John Dickey	NewFields	jdickey@newfields.com 916-329-3117

Agenda

Salton Sea Air Quality Technical Working Group Meeting

9:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.
May 15, 2008

CA Department of Fish and Game Conference Room
3602 Inland Empire Blvd. Suite C-220
Ontario, California

- | | | |
|-------------|---|---|
| 9:30-10:15 | Welcome and Introduction – Purpose of the Meeting and Desired Outcomes, Schedule Update, Update on the Legislation | Chuck Keene/DWR, Sylvia Oey/ARB |
| 10:15-11:45 | Baseline Salton Sea Air Quality Monitoring Network – Summary of Preliminary Site Visit, Finalized Network Design, Procurement, and Siting | Earl Withycombe/ARB |
| 11:45-12:45 | LUNCH | |
| 1:00-1:30 | Development of the Five Year Plan and the Monitoring Assessment Plan (MAP) | Jerry Boles and Chuck Keene/DWR |
| 1:30-2:45 | Discussion of Conceptual Proposals for Special Studies (e.g., Remote Sensing, Playa Characterization, and Dust Mitigation Measures) | Open Forum |
| 2:45-3:15 | Agency Comments, Additional Needs and Recommendations | ICAPCD, SCAQMD, Torres Martinez, ARB, EPA |
| 3:15-3:30 | Path Forward, Next Steps, Comments on the Draft Minutes for the February 27, 2008 SSAQTWG Meeting | Chuck Keene/DWR |
| 3:30 | Adjourn | |

Meeting Minutes

Chuck Keene, DWR, welcomed the group, and each attendee provided their name and affiliation. Chuck outlined the goals of the meeting, which included discussion of the following:

- Monitoring network implementation, and how it will fit into currently available funds
- Legislation (Update on Senate Bill (SB 1256 and SB 187)
- Other plans and documents that are being prepared (i.e., the Monitoring and Assessment Plan [MAP], the Five Year Plan)
- Priorities for future programs and studies –What is the direction forward for the air quality program and the Salton Sea Air Quality Technical Working Group (SSAQTWG)
- What are the key questions for the future, and how do we best answer them?
 - 1) Focused studies
 - 2) More monitoring
 - 3) Some combination of focused studies and monitoring

Chuck described the two bills currently in front of the legislature. SB 1256 would establish a Governance Council for the Salton Sea Ecosystem Restoration Program. SB 187 is the implementation bill for the restoration, and if passed, it would allow the State to move forward on the first phase of the Preferred Alternative (the Five Year Plan). Pat Cooper, from Senator Ducheny's office, passed around information sheets on SB 1256 and SB 187. Pat reported that SB 1256 was placed in suspense pending budget considerations, as a State-mandated local program. She explained that anything that costs the State money is automatically placed in a suspense file pending a State budget.

A question was asked regarding why there were two bills. Pat responded that the first bill did not include a governance structure, and legislators had requested that this be clarified.

Chuck moved on to describe why this is important to the air quality group, explaining that these bills would allow forward movement on the baseline air quality monitoring network, and other air quality studies. Without passage of the bills, the State does not have authorization to move forward. As a further complication, the existing Fish and Game Code does not include or allow for any funding of air quality plans, studies, or projects, unless the Legislature adopts a preferred project.

The State has some funding for species conservation at the Salton Sea under Proposition 84, but there are limitations on this funding. It is not currently possible to use this funding for air quality studies, and expenditures for planning and monitoring cannot exceed 10 percent of the total funding. The 10 percent limitation does not apply to environmental documents prepared under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), nor does it apply to design or project implementation.

When the State realized that it did not have funding to move forward, they went to the IID Water Transfer Joint Powers Authority (JPA) to discuss the possibility of funding the

baseline air quality monitoring under the Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Plan for the IID Water Conservation and Transfer Program (the Water Transfer MMRP). Bruce Wilcox, IID, explained that the JPA is the funding arm for the Water Transfer MMRP, and the JPA Implementation Team (IT) is the technical, decision making arm, which recommends the budgets and proposed expenditures to the JPA for approval. The JPA IT consists of representatives from IID, California Fish and Game, and the US Fish and Wildlife.

The JPA has a five year budget plan, and they are currently in year 4. They did not originally budget for air quality, but they have re-evaluated their budget priorities, in response to the State's request. The JPA has identified \$1 million in available 2008/2009 funds for air quality-related activities. Bruce explained that the JPA IT will look to the SSAQTWG for technical direction of the current and future air quality program, and requested that the working group develop information on priorities and budget requirements for the next 5 years, for JPA use in overall MMRP budget development. The 5 year JPA MMRP budget is updated annually.

We are currently using Proposition 50 and 84 funds, but cannot count on future use of these funds to purchase, operate, or maintain air quality equipment. Sylvia Oey, ARB, asked where the spending restrictions are coming from, and asked for a written description of the issues for her management. Chuck agreed to put this description together.

The initial ARB estimate for the baseline air quality monitoring program was approximately \$2 million. The program is now limited to \$1 million in available funding, including any needed operations and maintenance (O & M)-related funding in the first year.

Chuck asked Earl Withycombe, ARB, to revise the air monitoring budget to fit into the estimated \$1 million JPA budget. Earl was tasked with prioritizing equipment, given the budget limitations. Two possibilities were discussed, including limiting the number of stations or limiting the equipment at each station.

Sylvia reiterated the importance of adequate baseline monitoring, because the State is responsible for funding the Water Transfer MMRP implementation once the JPA expends \$133 million. The State has responsibility for protecting ambient air quality in the area, while also protecting the State's long term interest with regard to mitigation costs.

Baseline Salton Sea Air Quality Monitoring Network – Summary of Preliminary Site Visit, Finalized Network Design, Procurement, and Siting

Earl began his presentation on the updated baseline air quality monitoring network. A pdf file of Earl's presentation will be posted on the DWR Salton Sea website. Earl focused on the 1st year's priorities, because of the funding and schedule uncertainties.

Earl began with re-introduction of the goals and objectives for baseline air quality monitoring. These include collection and management of data needed to:

- Develop an air quality and meteorological database sufficient to support regional air quality attainment planning and modeling.
- Attain and maintain the State and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS and NAAQS), with special focus on the federal nonattainment pollutants ozone and PM10, and their precursors.
- Evaluate baseline air quality adjacent to the Salton Sea, and assess the impacts of baseline or existing sources at or near the Salton Sea (and to support future disaggregation of existing source contributions).
- Identify and mitigate adverse project impacts to air quality. This will likely require consideration of additional sites for monitoring during the construction and operation phases of any proposed restoration projects.

The primary pollutant of concern is PM10, the coarse fraction of particulate matter with particles between 2.5 and 10 microns in aerodynamic diameter (i.e., between PM2.5 and PM10 in size). In the Salton Sea Air Basin, the coarse fraction, or PM10, is largely a result of fugitive and windblown dust.

Al Kalin, Imperial County Farm Bureau, noted that the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) and the agricultural industry have worked hard to develop strategies and Best Management Practices to decrease dust emissions. Al also noted that agricultural dust emissions are seasonal, and that agricultural sources emit only a small portion of area dust.

Monitoring sites may have to be moved, or the network expanded, as the restoration program and/or the water transfer progress.

Current Monitoring Parameters List (Inclusive):

PM10 – continuous and filter-based
PM2.5 – continuous and filter-based
PM toxic constituents, or hazardous air pollutants (HAPs)
Particulate deposition –agricultural concern
Ozone
Oxides of nitrogen, or NO_x
Carbon monoxide, or CO
Sulfur dioxide, or SO₂
Hydrogen sulfide, or H₂S (odor, water quality)
Ammonia, or NH₄ (odor, water quality)
Surface meteorology
Upper air meteorology

Monitoring Philosophy

Earl listed three key concepts supporting the proposed monitoring approach:

- Record continuous PM and meteorological data on short (sub-hourly) intervals to develop regional emission inventory and air quality model
- Operate sufficient monitors to characterize baseline air quality at populated areas forecasted to be impacted by proposed projects
- Ensure quality control and establish instrument comparability by co-locating research and regulatory PM monitors

To map areas of emissions strength, sub-hourly intervals for measurement are desired. Typical PM data is collected hourly, however data collected at 5-minute intervals will produce a better statistical data set. At the Owens Lake meeting, Larry Biland (EPA Region 9) suggested preparation of an extensive emission inventory for the Salton Sea Air Basin to support future attainment planning. Earl suggests developing the inventory from the modeling, using sub-hourly data. This will help differentiate project contributions from other emission sources, and will indicate the source strength of emissions, pointing to areas where control measures should be focused.

Jerry Boles, DWR, asked if you have an increase of some monitored compound, how do you distinguish if it is from the project and not from something else. Earl responded that it is very difficult if you only have one year of data, but if you have 5 years of baseline data it will better allow us to differentiate future project impacts from baseline emission sources. Earl added that records of activities that cause emissions should also be kept for future reference and comparison to monitored data. One example of activity data mentioned was building permit records. Another was records of scheduled off-road vehicle events.

Phil Fine, SCAQMD, added that there is spatial information that allows you to distinguish where things are coming from. You can also look at ratios of various pollutants to determine if they are coming from the playa or from other sources, like construction activities.

Sylvia said that perhaps the project needs observational information also. It may be helpful if the air quality monitoring technicians do on-the-ground reconnaissance as part of the project.

The prevailing wind directions determined the initial placement of the monitoring sites. Chuck noted that if the project moves forward there will be additional monitors for areas undergoing construction.

Jerry Boles asked how we know if the emissions are from the playa or from construction. Sylvia suggested placing monitors on both sides of large exposed playa areas to delineate playa emissions. Pamela Vanderbilt, CH2M HILL, indicated that there may be more spatial monitoring as the monitoring continues, and this could include Cox sand catchers.

Cox sand catcher results would indicate playa areas that are being exposed to sand movement, and potentially emissive as a result. Earl mentioned that we will ideally also use other techniques like remote sensing.

Arturo Delgado, DFG, suggested it may be helpful to put monitors outside the Salton Sea area. Phil and Earl explained that there is an existing monitoring network in the Salton Sea Air Basin, more focused on populated areas. We can use those existing monitors to help distinguish off site contributions.

Mike Walker, Reclamation, asked if it would make sense to have more monitors on the east side to distinguish project contributions versus baseline? Earl responded that the goal is to protect air quality where the public will be found, so we are not as concerned about areas like the eastern shoreline where people are not expected. He has focused on protection of public health, not habitats. Sylvia noted that this is only the first year network; what we are able to do with limited budget. Mike said that he was thinking “long-term,” wouldn’t we want this information to determine future impacts? Phil noted that as far as air quality networks go, this one is dense, more so than the existing network in Los Angeles. Al Kalin asked about the CIMIS stations and how important they are; are they working? Chuck agreed to look into this and to respond to Al’s questions and concerns.

Monitoring Priorities

One of the goals of the meeting is to identify priorities for monitoring, especially now that funding is limited. Earl explained that he developed the following priorities:

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Monitors</u>
1st Tier:	PM2.5 – continuous and filter-based PM10 – continuous and filter-based PM toxic constituents Surface meteorology Upper air meteorology
2nd Tier:	Hydrogen sulfide Ammonia
3rd Tier:	Ozone Oxides of nitrogen Carbon monoxide Sulfur dioxide Particulate deposition

Phil Fine said that he mostly agreed with Earl’s proposed priorities. One other idea to facilitate cost savings is to use one BAM, rather than two. Earl decided not to purchase co-located TEOMs. The BAMS are on Earl’s chop list also, because the Partisol samplers can also be rotated. Sylvia added that these priority recommendations were made from a

technical standpoint, but it is also important to consider public issues and concerns (e.g., odors from H₂S or NH₄).

Chuck asked if we could get some money from the water quality group to purchase some of the gaseous monitors, because the two groups share some of the same goals. Jerry Boles answered that the water quality group has the same financial constraints (a limit of 10 percent of the total budget for planning and monitoring). Phil Fine said that SCAQMD will have some NO_x monitors available. Adolfo Garcia, ARB, said ARB has some monitors and deposition equipment that they could offer (mostly 3rd Tier instruments).

James King, DRI, asked what was proposed as surface meteorological equipment. Earl responded:

- Three-dimensional (3D) wind measurements – 3D sonic anemometers at 10 meter height above ground surface
- Roughness – cup anemometers at 1, 2, and 10 meter heights
- Wind direction – sonic anemometer
- Solar radiation
- Temperature at 2 and 10 meters - thermistor
- Precipitation - use CIMIS data for now
- Relative humidity (RH) - at lower height (Phil Fine and James King suggested that RH could be coupled with a lower thermistor)

Proposed Baseline Air Quality Monitoring Sites

- 1- Whitewater River Outlet, near the Torres Martinez wetlands project
- 2- Salton City
- 3- Salton Sea Test Site
- 4- South Shore
- 5- Bombay Beach
- 6- Salton Sea State Recreation Area

Site Visit Summary

1) Whitewater River Outlet

This proposed site is near the Torres Martinez Tribe Wetlands Project. The site has good security; it is fenced and gated. There is currently a diesel pump near the potential monitoring site that the Tribe would like to replace with an electric pump. The Tribe is preparing a cost estimate for electricity installation. There is sufficient wind exposure. Current plans are to gravel the road and allow access only for maintenance vehicles, so there would be few, if any, locally biasing sources. Jonathan Chapman, Torres Martinez Tribe, said that the Tribal Council has given a green light to installing an air quality monitoring system on this site.

Carla Scheidlinger, AMEC, mentioned that this area is emissive; dust from playa was blowing when she visited on a windy day.

James King said that DRI has 3 sampling sites in this area. They found the area to be of moderately high emissivity, when compared to other sites. Emission levels tended to be lower at sites further south.

Phil Fine noted that these are the current conditions, regardless of emissivity. We are looking for changes over time. Pamela Vanderbilt said that it is good to have this air quality monitoring site near the DRI sampling sites. Phil mentioned that it would be good to have DRI do characterization studies at all the air quality monitoring sites, and James King responded that it is their intention to do so. They are doing chemical analyses of the coarse fraction, as well, at least at this site.

Jerry Boles asked if you would get dust from the “older”, more weathered playa, and the response was yes.

2) Salton City

The originally proposed site was found to be fully developed and under private ownership, resulting in poor wind exposure and very limited siting opportunity. One possibility was suggested at a nearby pump station in an undeveloped area near the shore, but the group on the site visit could not find a road to this site. There appeared to be a lot of off-highway vehicle (OHV) activity in the adjacent undeveloped area near the pump station. The ownership of the pump station site needs to be investigated and access capabilities confirmed. One other possibility is a firehouse that is surrounded by open ground, and located on a hill (good wind exposure), where there is not a lot of OHV activity. This became the backup location. There is also a potential location near some abandoned greenhouses. Al Kalin said that this is maybe where they tried to grow oysters and prawns at one time, but the venture was not successful.

3) Salton Sea Test Site

The site of the existing meteorological tower is near sand dunes in an area that is disturbed, and difficult to access. Sites adjacent to a paved road with potential electrical power were investigated, and another site near an orchard was discussed. Additional research is needed at this site.

4) South Shore

Between the New River and the Alamo River, there is 3-phase power available on a levee at the shoreline. A levee widening made from construction debris was originally thought to be a potential site, but the touring group observed corrosion at a nearby geothermal plant and thought that salt spray may be a problem in the area. The group decided that it may not be a good idea to locate the monitors on the edge of the Salton Sea, so they tried to identify a site away from the shoreline, but could not find available sources of 3-phase power. As a result, the group did not find a suitable location in this area.

Earl requested that Michael Green (ICAPCD) take a look around the area for site options, if he can find time to do so. Earl asked how far back from the Salton Sea to locate the site. Al Kalin responded that 100 yards would be sufficient to avoid salt spray.

Al said there is a platform located in the water in the middle of the Salton Sea, asking if we should site the monitoring station out there. Availability of power is an issue.

5) Bombay Beach

A levee of up to 12 feet in height extends around three sides of Bombay Beach, isolating the originally proposed site in an abandoned marina area, away from view by residents. Jerry Boles asked about vandalism and security. He suggested that the monitors be located where people can see them. The security concerns at this site convinced Earl not to place anything in trailers, but rather to use custom shipping containers, which would be more secure, to house the equipment.

6) Salton Sea Recreation Area

The first choice for a site is occupied by facilities operated by the California State Parks. These State facilities appear to be compatible with operation of a monitoring station. The touring group looked at another potential site north of the paved parking lot.

Next Steps

- Second phase of site selection to clearly identify proposed sites
- Determine site ownership, negotiate required leases
- Prepare environmental documentation as required under CEQA or other applicable laws and regulations
- RFQ process to select contractor(s) (RFQ process suggested by Bruce Wilcox; Phil Fine said he could provide a list of potential proposers)
- Construction (access roads; site grading; install electrical power, fencing, and communication lines)
- Instrument and container acquisition
- Acceptance testing of instruments in laboratory
- Container acquisition and outfitting at sites
- Equipment installation in containers
- Instrument performance testing
- Data collection and telemetry
- Quality checks
- Data management
- Operations and maintenance of monitoring network

Phil said that typically they performance test the instruments, place the container at the selected site, put in the instrument racks, hook up power, then install the equipment in the containers.

Kent asked Earl to describe the air quality model that he was planning to use. Earl explained that there are two:

1) Statistical Back Trajectory Model (Ron Henry)

This model creates back trajectories from 5-minute interval sampling data.

Several months of data are needed to estimate the emissions contributions from each parcel. Results are laid upon one another to form isopleths of emissions strength. This method has not yet been applied to a dust scenario, but Earl feels it has promise.

2) Gaussian Dispersion Model (e.g., CALPUFF)

This model is used at Owens Lake. It will require an emission inventory and information on the spatial distribution of sources.

Al Kalin asked why 3-phase power is desired vs. single phase. Earl responded that single phase won't handle the air conditioner (AC) cycling needed to keep the instruments cool in the containers. Al said that all the houses in the valley have AC units that run on single phase. Phil said that in a house it is okay to have voltage drops, but sensitive instruments cannot always withstand such voltage fluctuations. One suggestion was to put in a power conditioner to help with the problem; these units cost about \$2,000 each.

Chuck asked that comments on the monitoring network plan be sent to Earl by email. He felt it was important to move ahead to confirm monitoring sites. However, he noted that if we could not confirm all six sites, we should move ahead anyway; we don't want to hold up the baseline monitoring program. Chuck stated that we will also proceed with equipment purchase according to priorities which Earl will finalize.

Jerry Boles discussed the Five Year Plan. He described how one year ago the Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) was completed, and the Secretary of Resources made a recommendation of a Preferred Alternative to the Legislature. There are four phases envisioned for the Preferred Alternative:

- 1st Phase – Pre-Construction (the Five Year Plan covers this period)
- 2nd Phase – Major Construction
- 3rd Phase – Completion of Construction
- 4th Phase – Operations and Maintenance

Jerry explained that we can move forward on some activities in the Five Year Plan, for example:

- 1) Studies to provide additional information
- 2) Design to support the Preferred Alternative
- 3) Implementation of species conservation habitat (e.g., Early Start Habitat)
- 4) CEQA/NEPA studies to support future projects

However, as stated previously, SB 1256 needs to pass to allow air quality studies to proceed using state funding.

Monitoring & Assessment Plan (MAP)

USGS is preparing a monitoring and assessment plan, or MAP, as part of their Science Plan for the Salton Sea restoration program. Other groups (biology, hydrology) have

gone through the EPA data quality objectives (DQO) process to identify key questions, prioritize those questions, and design their monitoring programs to identify approaches for addressing these key questions. For air quality, things were done differently, partially due to the priorities set by the applicable regulatory requirements, so we are somewhat backtracking. We have proceeded with design of the air quality monitoring network, and we are now confirming our key questions, to make sure the monitoring will answer those questions. A finalized matrix of key questions will be sent out to the air quality working group soon, in a format similar to that being developed for the other focused technical working groups. Comments will be requested by email.

Open Discussion

Chuck moved to the next agenda item regarding the direction for future activities, conceptual proposals for special or focused studies, and next steps. He asked that the discussion cover how we should move forward and what needs to be done now, next year, and down the road.

Brad Poiriez, ICAPCD, mentioned that the biggest focus should be on getting the baseline monitoring program going. Apart from being the APCO, speaking as a resident, he stated that people want something tangible to be produced from all the meetings and plans (e.g., data about the air they breathe). This will help stakeholders to look ahead, and identify potential problems and solutions.

James King said that the monitoring network should be focused on understanding the sources and mechanisms that produce the problems (dust). This will give you a head start on fixing problems if they should arise. In the long run, as recession of the Salton Sea exposes playa, we will need an expanded monitoring program.

Chuck asked what else we should look at. Salt crusting? How do we solve these problems? James said that the mechanism for dust formation at Salton Sea is different from other areas (Mojave). Understanding the mechanisms that cause the problems will help scientists and engineers design the needed mitigation measures.

Phil Fine stated that for the 1st year, Earl's proposal for air quality monitoring looks good.

Jerry Boles said that there are already emissive areas, so we need to start looking at mitigation measures and control technology.

Phil mentioned the need for information to support emission inventories and emission rates (monitoring will be used to validate the statistical model).

Sylvia Oey said that other sources are small with respect to episodic emission rates from the playa.

Carla Scheidlinger suggested that we should develop mitigation measures, and test them out. She asked how we can build on things we already know, e.g., Owens Lake dust

control, salt chemistry at the Salton Sea, how much water is required for the various dust control methods. Carla volunteered that she has developed information on a tool box of options or techniques, and will distribute this to the group.

Mike Walker asked why we are doing DRI research if we don't know for sure we will get something out of it. James King said that the research will provide (1) characteristics of the soil on the playa, and (2) information on potential emissions and emission rates to use in development of mitigation measures.

Mike commented that if we assume that we will need to mitigate 70 percent of the exposed playa, any money we spend looking at mitigation measures will be well spent.

Debbie Soukup, UNLV, stated that the DRI research is helping understand how mineral salts form, fracture, and become emissive. To properly mitigate, we need to understand the causes of the problems: e.g., crust morphology, emissivity, mineralogy, and the processes happening at or near the surface. This knowledge is needed to properly mitigate the emissions and identify the best and the most cost-effective dust control measures.

John Dickey, NewFields, stated that the DRI information has been useful and inexpensive for the knowledge gained.

Sylvia Oey asked if we could get specific agricultural data (acreages and crop types) for areas around the Salton Sea. This would be helpful with area-wide emission inventories. Al Kalin responded that IID has information on all the crops in the area. The agricultural industry also has an inventory on tillage required by crop. Frank Stradling, Agrarian Research, suggested that if you superimpose a fallow lands map on a soil map, this would provide useful information.

Al suggested looking at inflows to the Salton Sea. There are restrictions on the amount of water available per acre of farmland. If there is a supply/demand imbalance, farmers will be more cautious on how much water they will use, and there will be less drainage into the Salton Sea. The water level could go down more quickly than anticipated. The white dust causes problems for local residents (e.g., asthma). The dust from desert does not seem to cause the same types of problems. We need to know what the white dust is. Al suggested that IID needs to be more proactive.

John Carter, IID, said that IID is contributing resources and a change of attitude is underway.

Chuck stated that we need to do both; continue monitoring and pursue focused investigations.

Phil Fine asked if we could leverage other sources of funding for studies of this type (e.g., the ARB Research Division).

Chuck stated that just because the State (DWR) is leading the current air quality effort, it does not mean we can only proceed if we have a restoration project. We must protect the State's long-term interest and public health.

Chuck pointed out that the JPA mitigation account, \$133 million, is not much money in the big picture. The State will be responsible after the \$133 million is spent. We need to do baseline air quality monitoring, regardless of the future of the project, and we need to address air quality problems, regardless of future actions.

Frank Stradling mentioned that some of the best control measures use little water, but these may be the most difficult to get supported and approved by the stakeholders. These measures may be very important in terms of the long-term pay-off and cost effectiveness.

Phil Fine asked how the RFQ process for future work will proceed, and who will review the qualification statements that are submitted. Chuck answered that this review effort would not likely include the whole group, but rather, a select few representatives, including the air districts.

James King asked if there has been a cost estimate for the data collection, storage, analysis, sample chemical analysis, etc. Earl responded that ARB will absorb costs for data storage and chemical analysis, but capacity may be an issue.

Mike Walker asked, once the Monitoring and Assessment Plan is complete, how will we prioritize future efforts? Chuck answered that the process will depend on SB 1256. If passed, the Governance Council may make decisions. If it does not pass, we will need to regroup and work with the JPA to prioritize future efforts. Pamela mentioned that if SB 1256 doesn't pass, we revert to the 4-Step Plan under the Water Transfer Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

Chuck summarized the input from the group:

- we need to beef up emission inventories,
- start up the baseline air quality monitoring network, and
- start looking into possible control technologies.

John Dickey said he felt that control projects would be the most important for the people of the valley. Chuck agreed that people want to see that something is being done.

Jonathon Chapman, Torres Martinez, mentioned that the Tribe is moving ahead to implement mitigation in the form of wetlands. They would like to find funding support for equipment.

Phil Fine suggested that the EPA (Region IX) be invited to these working group meetings. They have questions about attainment status and frequently ask him what is going on. Brad agreed and suggested bringing in the EPA earlier rather than later. He is concerned about how dust from this area may affect the attainment status for other areas of the valley.

Sylvia Oey said that this technical working group has demonstrated good coordination and cooperation, which has set the tone for continued progress.

Bruce Wilcox explained that they would like this group to remain the technical resource group, providing recommendations to the IT and the JPA. He encouraged more coordination with Imperial County APCD.

Chuck posed questions to the attendees. How should this group function and coordinate with the following entities and agencies: IT, JPA, ARB, local air districts, IID, land owners, other resource agencies? He asked, "How can we improve this group?"

Al Kalin asked, "What is the white dust, how do we stop it, and when?"

Phil Fine asked if there are plans for public meetings. Chuck and Jerry Boles responded that public outreach is part of the Five Year Plan. This will occur even without passage of SB 1256. Public questions regarding the proposed air quality monitoring network may include the following, so we need to be prepared with responses: 1) why these sites, and 2) why these monitors?

Arturo Delgado, DFG, explained that the Fish and Game Code, Section 2932, specifies what Salton Sea Restoration Funds can be used for projects at the Salton Sea. Different sources of funding go into this fund.

Chuck said that he will put together a matrix that will explain applicable funding constraints, in response to Sylvia Oey's request.

The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for July 2008, in Ontario.

Goals for the next meeting are to finalize the equipment purchase plans, and develop the five-year (2010-2015) air quality plan and budget estimate for the JPA.